

*R. England Church of Catechism*  
A N

3504

# APPENDIX

TO THE



## CHURCH CATECHISM.

Chiefly designed for such young Persons, as having been regularly baptized and confirmed, have also renewed their Engagements, and strengthened their Graces, by the Participation of the Great Christian Sacrifice, at GOD's Holy Altar.

But which may be useful also to older People, namely in strengthening those who are wavering, and in raising up such as have fallen from the Communion of the Church,

May GOD accompany it, with his Blessing, for that good End.

*Building up yourselves on your most holy Faith, Jude 20.*

*For the Time will come when they will not endure sound Doctrine, 2 Tim. iv. 3.*

L O N D O N:

# P R E F A C E.

**I**F ever a Convocation should think fit to revise the Catechism of the Church, to whose Authority and Judgment an Affair of that Nature ought to be entirely submitted; it is possible they may find it necessary to add some Questions concerning those who have the Power of administering Sacraments, and how they receive such an Authority, and what Duties are owing by GOD's Word to our spiritual Guides. Because such a sort of Instructions, early instilled into tender Minds, might in the next Generation retrieve that respect to the sacred Order which we so scandalously want in this; and they would have this farther Advantage, that they would be a Means of keeping Men stedfast to the Communion of the Church, and of preserving them from falling into Schisms, even in a State of Persecution; from the Possibility of which no human Establishment can secure the Church of GOD, while she is Militant here upon Earth. And till this can be effected, it is to be wished the Reverend Clergy would more frequently instruct the People in such Duties; the want of which necessary Knowledge makes the Principles of Church-Communion so little understood, that Men are tossed to and fro, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, by the Slight of Men, and cunning Craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive, Eph. iv. 14.

I am very sensible, great Modesty hath prevailed upon the Clergy to divert their Thoughts from this Subject, lest it should be interpreted a preaching up themselves; but the same Fears may as well prevent Parents from instructing their Children, and Masters their Servants, in those Duties that relate to themselves; and since the Reason does not hold good in the one Case, it cannot be thought conclusive in the other.

# APPENDIX

TO THE

## CHURCH CATECHISM.

**Q.** *CHRISTIANS* in their Creed profess their Belief in three different Persons, and yet but one GOD. But is not this absurd?

**A.** No; in asserting this, we assert no Absurdity, because we do not believe them to be three and one, in the same *Respect*: That is, we do not believe them to be three *Persons*; and yet but one *Person*; or three *Gods*, and yet but one *God*; but we only believe, that, in the divine Nature, there are three distinct Substances.

**Q.** Have you no other Way of clearing this Doctrine from Absurdity?

**A.** Yes; from considering the Nature of an Absurdity; it *obviously* appears, that the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity cannot be justly charged as such: For an Absurdity is an Opposition between two *known* Ideas; but we have no Idea at all either of the divine Nature, or of a divine Person, and therefore it is impossible to shew, that there is any Contradiction, in believing

that three divine Persons may subsist in the same divine Nature.

Q. *I own this Argument seems to be conclusive, and therefore should stop the Mouths of Infidels: But, pray, whence have we this account of the Holy Trinity?*

A. From the sacred Scriptures, which are the Word of GOD.

Q. *In what Manner does the Bible speak of this great Mystery?*

A. It asserts, that the Father being GOD of himself, did, from all Eternity, beget the Son in his own Likeness, who is therefore GOD of GOD, and that the Holy Ghost eternally proceeded from the Father and the Son, or through the Son.

Q. *How does it appear, that the Bible is the Word of GOD, as you alledge?*

A. By many convincing Arguments, and particularly by the Testimony of these who had best Opportunities of knowing the Truth.

Q. *But is Testimony sufficient, in a Case of this Kind?*

A. Matters of Fact, are capable of no other kind of Proof, and it is unreasonable to demand greater Evidence than the Nature of the Thing will admit of. Now, whether the holy Scriptures were writ by Persons authorized by GOD for that Purpose or not, is a Matter of Fact, and there-

fore



fore cannot be *demonstrated*, but must be *proved* by *Testimony* only. — And, indeed, this Evidence is so strong, as to be acknowledged, on all Hands, sufficient to prove *any Point*, providing the Witnesses adduced are credible.

Q. *Who are they that attest the Divinity of the Old Testament?*

A. The whole *Jewish* Nation, from the Times in which the several Books were written, to this Day.

Q. *What Proof could the Jews who first received these Books have, that the Penmen of them were authorized by GOD?*

A. They might be assured of that Point, either by Miracles, which such Persons performed, or by their foretelling future Events.

Q. *But may we not believe, that the Jews, who first received these Books, were imposed upon by artful Men, and so made to receive an Imposture, as a divine Revelation?*

A. I think not. *First*, Because it is not at all likely, that any Nation (far less so obstinate and worldly a People as the *Jews*) should receive so troublesome and so expensive a System of Religion, as these Books contain, without being certain that it was appointed by GOD. *2dly*, Because it is incredible, that a Book, so full of useful Precepts, and calculated to promote real Vir-

true and Religion, should have been writ by an Impostor, who must be supposed to be a bad Man: Or, if it may be alledged, that a crafty Priest, or a political Prince, for worldly Ends, might do such a Thing, yet it is certain, 3dly, That the Old Testament cannot be of that kind: For the Stile and Tendency of it, is diametrically opposite to that which must have been the Design of any Impostor: It contains many, tho' true, yet scandalous Reflections and Accusations against the very People upon whom it was to be imposed: It represents them as Rebels against their GOD, and Apostates from a Religion which they had received from Heaven: In short, it brands them with the most odious Names, and taxes them with the foulest Crimes, which certainly it would not have done, had it been the Contrivance of an Impostor; for his Business must have been to sooth the Minds of the People, by fair and flattering Speeches, and to enjoin nothing that was contrary either to their Inclination, or their Interest.

4thly, That the Books of the Old Testament are not forged, may likewise be concluded from this Consideration, that the *Jewish* Nation submitted to pay Tithes to their Priests, and to have their Lives and Fortunes determined by the Laws con-  
tained

tained in them, which, to be sure, they would not have done, without sufficient Proof that it was the Will of GOD they should do so: For Men have always been tenacious of their Interest, and very tender of what regards either their Lives or Fortunes. *5thly*, To add Strength to what has been said, let it be considered, that many Prophecies of the Old Testament have been fully verified; For Example, the Prophecy of the Destruction of the Temple by *Nebuchadnezzar*, Jer. xxxiv. 2. and of the Return of the *Jews* from their Captivity in the Days of *Cyrus*, Isai. xlv.; Which clearly proves, that the Books which contain these Prophecies are a divine Revelation. But, *finally* and *lastly*, if these Books were forged, it must have been either in the Days of *Moses*, when the Things (of which they give an account) were said to have been transacted, or, in some subsequent Age, both which are impossible,

2. *Why is this impossible?*

A. They could not have been imposed upon the People at the Time when the Things were said to be done which they give an account of, unless the Things themselves, and consequently the Account given of them, had been true; because the Books themselves appeal to the People then alive,  
for

for the Truth of what they narrate. For Example, the *Bible* tells us, *Deut.* xi. 2, &c. that the very People, for whose Sake it was writ, and to whom it was delivered, had been Slaves in *Egypt*, and were delivered from their Bondage by a mighty Hand and stretched out Arm: That they past through the Red Sea dry-shod, received the Law from the Mouth of GOD himself, in a most tremendous Manner, were fed miraculously with Manna, and wore the same Cloathes and Shoes for forty Years. Now, is it possible, that any Person, in his Senses, much less so many hundred thousand, could have been persuaded to believe, that such a Train of Miracles had been performed before their Eyes, and for their Sakes, if no such Miracles had been done, or to receive a Book, as the Word of GOD, which contained an Account of them? Surely not.

Q. *Well; this makes it clear, that the Old Testament could not have been forged in the Days of Moses: But why may it not have been contrived in subsequent Ages?*

A. The Old Testament asserts, that certain Monuments had been erected, and certain Feasts appointed to be kept, annually, in Commemoration of some Transactions and Events which are recorded in that Book to have happened to their Predecessors.

Now



Now, in whatever Age this Book is supposed to have been forged, every Person then alive had an irrefragable Argument against it, in his own Breast; because every one must have been conscious, that no such Monuments had been erected, nor any annual Feasts observed, or so much as heard of, till that Time, and consequently, the Book must have been rejected, as spurious, by the universal Voice of the Nation.

Q. *The Divinity of the Old Testament being thus confirmed,—What have you to say for the Divinity of the New?*

A. The same Arguments, both general and particular, are equally applicable to this, as to the former. It was received by the primitive Christians, who had Opportunities of enquiring into the Truth of it, and it has been received by the Church ever since.

Q. *But why may not the primitive Christians have been mistaken?*

A. Many of them were great and learned Men, that had carefully and diligently enquired into the Truth of Christianity before they became Converts; and therefore when they bear Testimony to this Book, as a Record of Matters of Fact, we have all the Reason in the World to believe them; since there is no Probability, nay,  
it

it is impossible, that they could be deceived themselves, and we are sure they would not endeavour to deceive us; because they gave the strongest Proof of their Sincerity, by laying down their Lives rather than deliver up their Bibles to their Enemies.

Q. *What other Arguments may be adduced to prove the Divinity of the New Testament?*

A. The Books suppose that they were written in the same Age wherein the Things recorded in them were transacted, and therefore could not have imposed upon the People of that Age, had they been a Forgery, for the Reasons before alledged in behalf of the Truth of the Old Testament. Nor,

2dly, Can they be a Forgery of latter Days, 1st, Because the Feast upon the Christian Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, in Memory of our blessed Saviour's Death, and the Change of the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian LORD's Day, as a Memorial of his Resurrection, are therein supposed to have been instituted about the Time when these Things happened, and to be observed ever after. Now, at whatever Period the New Testament can be supposed to be forged, this invincible Objection against it, must have been obvious to all, viz. that no such Feast in remembrance of CHRIST's Death, nor Day

of Worship, as a Memorial of his Resurrection had ever been celebrated among them; and, consequently, it never could have passed upon them as a divine Revelation, if the Things it asserts had not been strictly true. Again, the Factions, into which the Christian Church soon split; and which have subsisted in different Forms ever since, render it highly improbable, if not impossible, that the Bible can be a Forgery of later Days; for as we are sure, that the different Heresies could not in common Sense, nor consistently with their own Interest, have agreed among themselves to forge such a Piece; so it is most certain, that had any one Sect attempted to impose a Book upon the World, as a divine Revelation, the rest would have immediately appeared against it, and discovered the Cheat. Since therefore we never find any Question made concerning the principal Books of our *New Testament*, I mean, the Gospels, nor of the Epistles, two or three excepted, we may safely conclude that they were writ by the Persons whose Names they bear, and consequently, are the Word of GOD. And as for those that were at first questioned, and afterwards acknowledged, as of divine Original; to wit, the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, the Epistle of *St. James*, and the 2d of *St. Peter*, the Doubt, which was made at first concerning them, shews clearly, how careful the first Christians were, not to be imposed upon, in a Matter of such Importance as that of settling the Canon of the holy Scriptures; and also, manifestly proves, that these Books, as well as the rest, were written by inspired Penmen, since they were not received as the Word of GOD, till after due Enquiry, and Examination had, concerning them.

Q. *The holy Scripture was given, it is said, as a Rule for the Church; pray, what is the Church?*

A. The Word Church has a twofold Meaning; either it signifies the whole Body of Christians, under the invisible Bishop of our Souls, the LORD JESUS CHRIST, in which Sense it is called the *Catholick, or Universal Church*; or it signifies any Society of Persons, professing the Faith of CHRIST, who are governed by the Pastors of his Appointment.

Q. *Who are the Pastors of CHRIST's Appointment?*

A. There were three ecclesiastical Orders appointed by CHRIST, viz. Bishops, as Supreme, and Priests and Deacons, as subordinate to them.

Q. *If it be true, as the Church of England maintains, that the Order of Bishops, as distinct from, and superior to, Priests, is essentially necessary, how is it that the holy Scriptures have not expressly, and in so many Words, declared that CHRIST did appoint Bishops to be the Governors of his Church?*

A. The several Books of the *New Testament* were written to Persons who were already Christians, and were actually living under Episcopal Government, which being a Matter obvious to their Senses, it was no more necessary to enjoin it expressly, than it is to tell a *British* Subject that he lives under a Monarchy, not in Subjection to a Republick. However, there is sufficient Proof of the three Orders to be found in Scripture; and of the Bishops, as superior to the rest, especially, if we explain it as we ought, according to the consistent Testimony of the antient Catholick Church.

Q. *Can you name any of those Places which prove your Assertion?*

A. Yes: The Institution of Deacons is clearly mentioned,

ed,



ed, *Acts vi.* And *St. Paul's* Commands to *Timothy*, to lay Hands suddenly on no Man: and not to receive an Accusation against an Elder (Presbyter or Priest it should be translated) but before two or three Witnesses. *1 Tim.* ver. 19, 22. manifestly prove, 1<sup>st</sup>, That there were Elders or Presbyters then in the Church. And, 2<sup>dly</sup>, That *Timothy*, who had the Power, singly and alone, and without the Assistance of others, to ordain and censure such Presbyters, was himself superior to Presbyters, and therefore was a Bishop. Add to this; that the Co-temporaries of the Apostles, particularly *St. Ignatius* (supposed to be one of the Children, which our blessed SAVIOUR took in his Arms and blessed, *St. Mark x. 16.*) expressly speaks of the three distinct Orders, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and asserts the Necessity of the first, or Order of Bishops, to the very Being of a Church. Thus, in his Epistle to the *Trallians*, he tells them, that it is necessary to do nothing without their Bishop, (he means nothing concerning the Government and Worship of the Church) and orders them to be subject to their Bishop as to JESUS CHRIST, to the Presbyters, as to the Sanhedrim of GOD, and College of the Apostles, and to reverence the Deacons, as the Ministers of GOD: Adding, that without these, there is no Church. And again, he that is within the Altar is pure, but he that is without the Altar, *i. e.* out of the Communion of the Bishop, is not pure in his Conscience. So, in his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, he salutes them, in the Blood of JESUS CHRIST, if they are at Unity with their Bishop and his Presbytery, and the Deacons appointed by GOD—tells them that—as many as are of JESUS CHRIST, are also with their Bishop, that is, in Communion with the Bishop.

Bishop.—The contrary of which must be true, that they who are not in Communion with the lawful Bishops of the Church, in which they live, are not of JESUS CHRIST, that is, are not good Christians. In like Manner, he enjoins the *Smyrnelans* to esteem that Eucharist only valid, which is offered by the Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop shall give his Consent.—Whence it appears, that no Clergyman though regularly ordained, can officiate in any Place without the Authority of the lawful Bishop thereof. Much more to this Purpose might be quoted from this early Author : But as his Epistles are translated into *English* by Bp. *Wake*, I refer those that desire more Information on this Subject, to the Epistles themselves. Or they may consult Bp. *Potter*, on Church government : Bp. *Hall*, Dr. *Brett*, or Dr. *Hickes* upon Episcopacy, or Bp. *Sage's* Principles and Vindication of the *Cyprian* Age. And, I shall only further add, that the Order of Bishops has, from the Foundation of Christianity, been deemed so essential to the Being of a Church, that there never was a Church, down to the Reformation, in any Part of the World, wherein Episcopacy did not prevail : Nor is there one Example, for more than 1500 Years, to shew that Ordination by mere Presbyters was thought valid.

Q. *What do the Presbyterians say on this Subject ?*

A. They say that CHRIST appointed but one Order of preaching Ministers, sometimes called Bishops, sometimes Presbyters, who had the Power of Ordination, Administring the Sacraments, and Preaching the Gospel ; and two inferior Lay Orders, of Elders and Deacons, to assist the other in Church-discipline and Government. And they think that they themselves, are lawful Successors to these first Bishops or Presbyters.

Q. *Can*

2. *Can you confute them upon their own Principles?*

A. I think I can, and I'll try it, Thus: Though we should grant that Christ appointed but one Order of preaching Ministers, yet it cannot be denied (for all Histories agree in asserting) that two others, (the one called Priests or Presbyters, the other Deacons) were very early appointed by the Church. For the most learned among the Presbyterians acknowledge, that proper Episcopacy was established, with Priests and Deacons under the Bishops, about the Year 150: That is, within 50 Years of the Apostolic Age. Now as it is certain, that the first Order, which was then, and ever afterwards called Bishops, had alone the Power of Ordination, and continued to enjoy that exclusive Privilege, down to the Reformation; it is certain, I say, that this first Order must (if the Presbyterian Scheme be true) be that which CHRIST appointed, and not the Presbyters and Deacons, because these last had never the Power of Ordination, which it is certain the Presbyters of CHRIST's Appointment had. The Consequence then is, that the Presbyters and Deacons of the antient and modern Church, (upon the Presbyterian Supposition) were Officers of mere human Appointment, and not of divine Institution; from whence it follows, that they had no Right to preach the Gospel or administer Sacraments, and far less to ordain others. But the Presbyterians, if they have any Orders at all, derive them from this middle Order of Clergymen, called Presbyters, which, according to their own Doctrine, was not of divine but human Institution: And, consequently, it follows, that they are not Successors to that first Order of Ministers, which had alone the Power of Ordination; nor, by Parity of Reason, to that Order of preaching Ministers, which they say  
CHRIST

CHRIST appointed, because they were the same with the first Order, the Order of Bishops : And, consequently, it follows again, that Presbyterian Ministers have no lawful Ordination. See *Wells* against the Dissenters.

2. *How are the several Offices of Christian Ministers distinguished ?*

A. Not merely by distinct Names, but by having different Portions of Apostolical Power conferred upon them.

2. *What is the Office of a Deacon ?*

A. It appears, from holy Writ and the History of the Church, that Deacons were appointed, to visit the Sick, to take care of the Poor's Money, to assist the Bishop or Priest at the Altar ; to baptize, in the Absence of the Bishop or Priest, to offer up Prayers in public for the People, and, with the Bishop's Licence, to preach the Gospel.

2. *What is the Office of a Presbyter ?*

A. The Office of the Priesthood comprehends under it, all the Power of the Deacons, and withal, the Presbyter has a Right to offer the great Oblation, that is, to consecrate the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

2. *What is the Office of a Bishop ?*

A. The Bishop has all the Power of the Presbyter and Deacon, and moreover, enjoys the Privilege of Ordination, Confirmation, and Government.

2. *What is the Difference between Bishops, and Presbyters and Deacons, in the Exercise of their several Powers ?*

A. The Difference is this, that Presbyters and Deacons not only derive their Powers at first from the Bishops, but are always dependent upon, and accountable to their respective Bishops, even for the lawful Exercise of



of these Powers, which are competent to their respective Orders: Whereas, Bishops act by an independent and supreme Authority, in all the Offices that belong to them, and, in the lawful Exercise thereof, are subject only to the LORD JESUS CHRIST.

*May not any body that pleases assume these Offices?*

No: A Sacrament can only be administred by Persons commissioned by GOD for that Purpose.

*Why is a divine Commission necessary?*

Because Sacraments are Covenants, or Contracts, between GOD and Men: And surely, no Man can transact any Deed, in the Name of GOD, so as to bind him to Performance, without his Authority, since no Man can do so much for his Fellow-creature. Again, 2dly, Christian Ministers, and especially the Bishops, are in holy Scripture said to be Ambassadors for CHRIST, 2 Cor. v. 20. But surely no one can be an Ambassador, without a Warrant for that Purpose.

*Do not Learning and Wisdom then give a sufficient Authority to be a Clergyman?*

A. By no means: The Apostle asks, how a Man can preach, except he be sent? Rom. x. 15. which plainly supposes that no Man ought to assume the Character of, or can lawfully act, as a Clergyman, without a divine Commission. Besides, the great Author of our Salvation, in whom was the Fulness of Wisdom and Knowledge, and who received the holy Spirit without Measure, did not assume the Office of a Priest, till he was commissioned by his Father by an audible Voice from Heaven. So saith St. Paul, Heb. v. 5. CHRIST glorified not himself to become an High Priest, but he that said unto him—Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee: Which shews, that Learning and other Talents, however necessary for the

the Performance of the Office, in a proper Manner; do not constitute the Character of a Minister; it being here, as in other Things, that though natural and acquired Parts; do enable a Man to discharge that important Function with Honour to himself and Advantage to Mankind, yet they do not confer the Right to act: Just as it is not the Abilities to be a General, which makes a Man a Commander, but the King's Commission.

Q. *By what Method then is the Christian Priesthood perpetuated?*

A. Priests and Deacons are ordained by the Hands of a single Bishop, and Bishops are consecrated by three of the same sacred Order. Though, in case of absolute Necessity, no doubt, but a Consecration by one would be valid, as each of them, according to St. Cyprian, are entrusted with the whole Power of the Episcopate.

Q. *Since Christian Ministers have thus a divine Commission, and have such Powers conferred upon them by GOD, in what Light ought the People to consider them?*

A. They ought to consider them as Persons to whom GOD hath committed the Word of Reconciliation, 2 Cor. v. 19. to offer Peace and Happiness upon the Terms of the Gospel to all the World; as Persons appointed to intercede with GOD for Men, by offering up Prayers, and the Sacrifice of the holy Eucharist, to Heaven in their Name; and finally, as Fellow-labourers with, but under CHRIST, in the great Work of Man's Salvation.

Q. *What is the Duty which People owe to their spiritual Pastors?*

A. Clergymen being appointed to an Office so honourable and important, have undoubtedly a Right to love

Love and Esteem, for their Work's Sake. And the Bishop and such Presbyters as act by his Authority, have a just Claim to Obedience, in all Things that relate to the Government of the Church, or other spiritual Matters, because they watch for their Souls, *Heb. xiii. 17.* Farther, the People ought to hearken to their sacred Precepts; should take in good Part their pious Admonitions, and even Reproofs, when there is Occasion for them: They should resort to the most judicious of them, for Comfort and ghostly Counsel, when their Consciences are burdened by any grievous Sin: Should pray for a Blessing upon their Labours, and that they may be enabled to discharge their Duty faithfully: And finally, should supply their Wants, by communicating to them a Share of their Substance. *1 Cor. xvi. 15, 16. Phil. ii. 29. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13, 14. 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14, &c.*

2. *In your Definition of a particular Church, you called it a Society: Pray, what do you mean by that Word, and how does it differ from the Word Sect?*

A. By a Society is meant any Number of Men united together, into one Body, by certain particular Laws and Rules, and that under the Direction of certain Persons, or Governors appointed by the Founder of it, with Power to execute those Laws, and to punish such Members as wilfully transgress them. Whereas a Sect, is only a Number of Men, professing the same, or similar Opinions, without any Authority or Power over one another.

2. *How do you prove that the Christian Church is a Society, in this Sense of the Word?*

A. From *Matth. xxviii. 18, 19. Go ye and teach all Nations, baptizing, &c. compared with John xx. 21. As my Father hath sent me, so send I you.* Where it ap-

pears, that our Blessed SAVIOUR gave a Commission to his Apostles, to convert the World; to unite them into one visible Body or Church by Baptism, and to appoint proper Officers to rule and govern it after their Decease; and, in short, empowered them to give Order, that a Succession of Governors for his Church, should be perpetuated till the End of the World. Accordingly, by virtue of this Commission, the Apostles did preach the Gospel and admit their Converts into the Church by Baptism, and ordained Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, to govern every particular Church in their Absence, commanding them to feed the Flock of GOD, over which the HOLY GHOST had made them Overseers, *Acts* xx. 28. and the People to obey those Officers, and submit themselves unto them, as unto the Ministers of GOD, who watched for their Souls, as Persons who must give an Account, *Heb.* xiii. 17. *1 Cor.* xvi. 15, 16.

Farther, that the Church is a Society, appears from its being compared to, or called a *Kingdom*, *Dan.* ii. 44. A *City*, *Heb.* xii. 22. A *House* or *Household*, *Heb.* iii. 2, 6. A *Polity* or *Common-wealth*, *Eph.* ii. 12. And finally, a *Body*, or the Body of CHRIST, *Eph.* iv. 12. and elsewhere; all which Things or Comparisons are themselves Societies, or Bodies of Men united under proper Governors, and consequently it follows, that the Church, which is compared to them, must be a Society likewise.

Q. *What do you infer from the Church being a Society?*

A. That it is not sufficient, barely to believe the Articles of the Christian Faith, and obey the Rules of Morality; but that we are also obliged to be made Members of the Church by Baptism, and ever after to live in her Communion, by frequenting her public  
Worship,



Worship, and partaking in her Sacraments; and finally, that we are obliged likewise, to obey, in spiritual Things, her lawful Governors or Bishops.

2. *How does all this follow, from the Church being a Society?*

A. It follows evidently: Because, if GOD has given the Bishops, and such as they appoint, Power to baptize, to administer the Holy Eucharist, to offer up Prayers in Publick for his People, and in one Word, to be Governors of the Church, then it must be the Duty of all Persons, to receive Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, from their Hands; to join in the Worship offered up by these Ministers, and in short, to be subject, as to the external Government and Polity of the Church, to the supreme Governors of it, that is the Bishops. And they that refuse to receive the Sacraments in this Manner, must probably forfeit the Benefit of our blessed SAVIOUR's Death, which (ordinarily speaking) are only conveyed to Christians by their Means.

2. *How does it appear that the Benefits of CHRIST's Death, Pardon of Sins, to wit, and the Grace of the Holy Spirit, are ordinarily confined to the Use of Sacraments?*

A. From many Places of Holy Scripture, particularly, *Acts* xxii. 16. *1 Cor.* xii. 13. and *St. John* vi. 53, 54. Where Pardon of Sins, the Assistance of the Spirit, and Life itself, that is spiritual Life, are expressly declared to be communicated thereby.

2. *How far does the Obligation to join in public Worship, and receive the Sacraments, extend?*

A. To all ordinary Cases, that is, all Persons are obliged to perform these Duties, whenever they can do them as CHRIST appointed; I mean, whenever they have

have the Opportunity of a lawful Clergyman, and one that requires no sinful Term of Communion.

2. *Will Difficulty or Danger in obtaining them be no Excuse?*

A. Neither Difficulty or Dangers hinder us from prosecuting our worldly Business; and surely, as the Concerns of our Soul are of more Importance, they can be no Excuse for the Neglect of our weightiest Matters. Indeed to abstain from public Worship, and despise the Holy Sacraments, is virtually to deny our Blessed SAVIOUR before Men; and whosoever denieth Him, them he will deny before his Father and his Holy Angels, *Matth. x. 32.*

2. *But what if People have not the Opportunity of a regular Clergyman, may they not join, in that Case, with those who have not the Authority of the Bishops?*

A. No: If GOD, in his Providence, deprive Men of the Benefit of a lawful Clergyman, then public Worship and Sacraments cease to be a Duty: for he is not a *Pharaoh* to require Brick without Straw; nor will he impute that to us as a Crime, which is only our Misfortune. But to join with those, who either usurp the Priesthood, or act irregularly, upon the Pretence of Necessity, is absurd in itself, and is founded upon an erroneous Opinion, that Worship and Sacraments are absolutely necessary to Salvation: Whereas, they are only *ordinarily* so, that is, when they can be got in the Manner CHRIST appointed them, as I have said. Meantime let it be remembered, that the most pressing Necessity did not excuse *Saul* for offering Sacrifice, 1 *Sam. xiii. 11, 12.* nor *Uzzah* for touching the Ark, 1 *Chron. xiii. 9.* and consequently, it will not vindicate Christians in worshipping GOD contrary to his own Institution. He alone has a Right to

command, *how and by what Persons Prayer and Sacraments are to be performed*, and we must upon no Pretence heap up to ourselves, Teachers having itching Ears, but keep strictly to those who are regularly appointed, that is to the Bishops, and such only as are authorized by them.

*Q. Did the primitive Christians believe the Necessity of communicating with some pure Part of the Church, and with the lawful Bishop of the Diocese, in order to Salvation.*

. Yes, the antient Christians thought an Exclusion from the Communion of the Church, by a regular Excommunication, was an Exclusion from the Kingdom of Heaven, according to St. *Matth.* xviii. 18. and therefore they willingly endured the severest Penalties, in order to be admitted into it again, after they had been separated, for their Offences.

*Q. What do you infer from the Practice of the Antients in this Matter?*

. That since the Necessity of external Participation of Worship and Sacraments, in the visible Communion of the lawful Bishop of the Diocese (or in case of a Vacancy of the See, of the Metropolitan, or other Bishop, who by the local Custom had the Inspection of it,) was universally believed in the very Age next to the Apostles, it must therefore have been taught by them as a fundamental Doctrine.

*Q. Do you think then that all are damned who do not hold Communion with some pure Part of the Church, or with the lawful Bishop of the Diocese?*

. GOD forbid. For considering how small a Part of the Christian Church is pure, and how few hold Communion with the Bishops, as they ought, it might well be said, Who then could be saved? The Heathens, to

whom the Gospel has not yet been promulgated, cannot be bound by the Laws of the Gospel. And even of those that have been educated Christians, but by Misfortune have been brought up in Errors, and out of the Communion of the Bishop, Charity obliges us to hope, and even believe, that GOD, who is infinite in Mercy, will have Compassion on such of them as do not offend wilfully, and from a Contempt of Divine Authority, but err through Ignorance; because He knows the Weakness and Infirmary of our Nature, how apt it is to be biassed the wrong Way, and how difficult it is to overcome the Prejudices of Education, and to correct the first Impressions. This, however, will not vindicate those, who, having an Opportunity, neglect to inform themselves, or who, knowing themselves to be in the wrong, continue Members of a corrupt Church, for Interest, or out of Fear, and such other worldly Considerations. Far less will it excuse such Persons as have been once in the right Way, and yet, for the Ends above mentioned, forsake the true Communion of the Church, because then the Crime is wilful.

Q. *But is there no Indulgence to be given in Time of Persecution, or even of Danger only? May not one join, either in Worship or Sacraments, with Clergymen that have not the Authority of the lawful Bishop of the Diocese, providing they have been Episcopally ordained; since, by this Method, they may escape the Danger, and preserve themselves and Families in Safety?*

A. By no means: For GOD has obliged us to believe all that he has revealed, and obey all that he has commanded, in Time of Persecution, as well as in Time of Peace; and, consequently, if it be a Duty at any Time to worship GOD in the Communion of some



pure Part of his Church, and by the Mediation of some lawful Bishop, or Priest appointed by him, (as most certainly it is,) then it must be a Duty *at all Times*, because Prosperity or Adversity makes no Difference : We must not commit the least Sin, or omit the least known Duty, though we could thereby preserve our Persons or Estates, in Safety; for he that in this Way saveth his Life shall finally lose his Soul, *Matth. x. 39.* and he that breaketh the least of GOD's Commandments, and continueth therein, shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven, *Matth. v. 19.* that is, saith Dr. *Hammond*, shall be despised and rejected by GOD, in the Day of Judgment. This was said by our Blessed SAVIOUR, at a Time, when Men run the greatest Hazard in professing Christianity : And, if it was so great a Crime then to break the least of GOD's Commandments, notwithstanding that the keeping them exposed Men to the Loss of Liberty and Life itself; surely, were the Danger of adhering steadily to the Communion of the Church greater at present, than, Thanks to GOD, it really is, that would not be an Excuse before GOD for the Neglect of so great a Duty. Because it is the Christian Principle, to suffer rather than to sin: Indeed the Prophet *Daniel* seems to have been of the same Mind, and hath set us in this respect a very glorious Example; for he refused to omit his Prayers to GOD, only for thirty Days, though he knew that for continuing in his Duty, he would be thrown into the Den of Lions; and all the primitive Christians, for three hundred Years, afford the most remarkable Proofs of the same Zeal and Steadfastness, in as much as they persevered in the Practice of all the Branches of Religion, at the Hazard of losing every Thing

Thing that is dear in this World. Had these blessed Saints known the Secret, which many of the Clergy, as well as Laity now practise, of sacrificing the Truths of GOD to secular Interest, and Christian Principles to popular Applause, they need not have undergone so much Reproach and Persecution as they did; but might have carved out (had such Truckling been allowable) a much easier Way to Heaven: But they had not so learned CHRIST; they knew that Christians are obliged at *all Times* to *do the whole Will of GOD*, and therefore were constant in all the Particulars of their Duty; and especially were careful to avoid all unlawful Worship, and the least Tendency to Schism, even when Adherence to the true Communion of the Church was most dangerous.

Q. *What is the proper Notion of Schism?*

A. Schism in a Clergyman, is Setting up an Altar, against the Altar of the lawful Bishop; that is, officiating in opposition to the Bishop; or in case the Diocese be vacant, officiating in opposition to the Metropolitan, or Primus, who, by the Canons of the Church, has the Care of such Diocese, during its Vacancy. And it is Schism in a Lay Person, to join in Worship, or Sacraments, with such irregular Clergymen, who act in opposition to their Superiors.

Q. *Why is it necessary to acknowledge the Authority of, and live in Communion with, the Bishop of the Diocese or other Superiors?*

A. Because the Bishop is the visible Head, under CHRIST, of his own Church or Diocese, and is the Principle of Unity to it. Whence, it is only by living in his Communion, that any Christian, whether Clergyman or Layman, can hold Communion with the Catholic Church, or with CHRIST, the Head  
of

for other Bishop, who, by the Canons of the Church, has the Care of such Diocese, during its Vacancy. And it is Schism in a Lay Person, to join in Worship, or Sacraments, with such irregular Clergymen, who act in opposition to their Superiours.

Q. *Why is it necessary to acknowledge the Authority of, and live in Communion with, the Bishop of the Diocese or other Superiours?*

A. Because the Bishop is the visible Head, under CHRIST, of his own Church or Diocese, and is the Principle of Unity to it. Whence, it is only by living in his Communion, that any Christian, whether Clergyman or Layman, can hold Communion with the Catholic Church, or with CHRIST, the Head of it. Besides, GOD, who is a GOD of Order, not of Confusion, has commanded all Persons, Clergy as well as People, to obey those that have the Rule over them, τοις ἡγεμενοῖς the Governors or Bishops; and consequently, if a Priest thrusts himself irregularly into a Charge, that is, in opposition to the Bishop, who is the real or temporary Head of the Diocese, (especially when Necessity in no Sense can be pleaded for such a Step,) he, by that Action, violates this divine Precept, which is so requisite for the Sake of Peace and Order. For, since Bishops must be acknowledged, by all of the Episcopal Persuasion, to be supreme Governors of the Church, under the LORD JESUS CHRIST; it necessarily follows, that no inferior Priest can officiate regularly, but by acting in Subordination to them, and by their Authority; it being impossible, that GOD should authorize the Bishops to be supreme, and yet make it lawful for Presbyters to act without or

against their Leave: Because, that would be the same Absurdity as to suppose a King to give a General Commission to be Commander in Chief of his Army, and yet give allowance to the inferior Officers to dispute or disobey his Orders: In which Case, nothing but Confusion and Disorder could ensue.

2. *If then Priests cannot lawfully, i. e. without a Violation of the Laws of G O D and his Church, leave one Congregation, or assume another, without the Episcopal Authority, are not Bishops obliged to grant their Permission for such Clergymen as regularly apply to them, and against whom no canonical Objection can be made?*

A. Most certainly they are. And if any of them refuse, an Appeal may be made to a national Synod, or to the Majority of the Bishops in the Kingdom, who are obliged in Conscience, and it is to be presumed, will not fail to do them Justice.

2. *How comes it to pass that Schism, or acting in opposition to the Bishop is so great a Sin?*

A. It is a great Sin, because of its being a direct Contempt of G O D's Authority, who has given them a Power over all within their Diocese, for the Edification of his Church: And farther, because it is destructive of Love, Peace, and Unity among Christians, which are not only great Virtues, but the very distinguishing Badge of our Blessed L O R D's Disciples. *Hereby shall all Men know that ye are my Disciples, saith C H R I S T, if ye have Love one to another, John xiii. 33. and Rom. xiv. 19. Let us follow the Things which make for Peace, and Things wherewith we may edify one another.* So, the Necessity of Unity is taught, *Eph. iv. 3.* where we are commanded to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace. And our L O R D, to shew the Importance



of it to his Church, begs of GOD in his last solemn Prayer, immediately before his Crucifixion, that his Apostles (and in them all his Followers to the End of the World) might be *one*, even as HE and his FATHER are one, *John xvii. 11.* But it is impossible that there can be Unity or Peace in any Church, unless the inferior Clergy submit to the Government of their Bishops, in all Things lawful, but will rebel and act in opposition to them when they please; for, by this Means, the Church is split into Factions and Parties, which tear and devour one another. And therefore, no wonder when our Blessed SAVIOUR foresaw (what the Experience of every Age has proved) that Rebellion against Superiors would engender Hatred, Variance, and Contention, that both He and His Apostles, should so strictly forbid Schisms and Divisions, and so frequently admonish us to be of *one Heart and one Mind, and to speak the same Things; not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the Manner of some is; but to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace, and to submit ourselves to those who are over us in the LORD.* So that it is our Duty to submit to lawful Governors, even though they should over-stretch their Authority a little, unless they require us to believe, or do something which is sinful: For this the Rules of Society, and the Good of the Church, demand; it being much better even to bear some Hardships, than to kindle the Fire of Contention, by an ill-timed Opposition. Indeed, unless this Rule be observed, no Church or Society would long subsist in Peace: For, as Bishops and Magistrates are but Men; they are liable to Mistakes as well as other People, and if these lesser Faults were sufficient to justify Rebellion, turbulent and factious

factious Men would never want a Pretence, to keep the House of GOD, and even the Kingdom, perpetually in a Flame.

2. *But is it not sufficient to justify a Clergyman's officiating, that he be once regularly ordained, and be authorized by any Bishop? For Example, may not a Scottish Bishop authorize a lawful Clergyman in England, or an English Bishop authorize a Clergyman to act in Scotland, without Schism?*

A. No. For it is as necessary, for the sake of Peace and Order in the Church of GOD, that each Bishop be limited in the Exercise of his Office to his own Diocese, as it is requisite for the Preservation of Order and Government in the Kingdoms of the World, that the Power of each Sheriff be confined within his own County, or of each Provost, within his own City. For if any Bishop could himself act, or empower any Clergyman to act, within the Diocese of another Bishop, in opposition to that Bishop, this would necessarily produce Confusion, Disquiet, and Disorder, and therefore cannot possibly be allowed by an infinitely wise Being, who is a GOD of Order, and who hath commanded that all Things be managed in his Church decently, and according to Order, 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

2. *May not one then lawfully join in Prayers with a Clergyman who acts without, or in opposition to, the Bishop of the Diocese: Providing he does not communicate with him?*

A. No. It has been already proved, that every Clergyman who acts without, or in opposition to, the lawful Bishop, is in some measure guilty of the Sin of *Korah, Dathan, and Abiram*; and consequently, to join with such, though but in Prayers, is giving Countenance to their Usurpation: Besides, as by this Means  
these

these Persons cause Schisms and Divisions in the Church, and we are expressly commanded to mark and avoid all them who do so, *Rom. xvi. 17.* therefore we cannot join with them without partaking in their Crime; nor finally without stumbling the weak, giving Scandal to the Faithful, and hardening others by our Example.

2. *What other Danger is there in communicating with those who act without the Bishop's Leave?*

A. Besides the Guilt of Schism, there is Danger that the Sacraments they receive will not be effectual for Salvation. For the first Christians believed, with St. *Ignatius*, that that Eucharist (and consequently Baptism) only is valid, which is administered in Communion with, and by the Permission of the Bishop; and thought that the Grace of GOD and other Benefits of our Blessed SAVIOUR's Death were not conveyed by the Sacraments of irregular Clergymen, though at first they might be lawfully ordained; at least not till the Persons who received them, were reconciled to the Peace of the Church. Thus, for Example; though they did not re-baptize any Person who had been baptized with Water, in the Name of the Holy Trinity, by an Episcopal Clergyman, yet if that Clergyman was out of Communion of the Church, or acted without the Leave of, or in opposition to, the lawful Bishop of the Diocese, that is, if he was in a State of Schism, they did not think that his Baptism was effectual for the washing away of Sin, till the baptized Person was received by the Bishop into the Communion of the Church; because Remission of Sins, they believed, could only be given in the Church, as the *Nicene Creed* teaches; and they thought that

no Clergyman was in the Church, who acted in opposition to the lawful Bishop. Nor is this Doctrine to be wondered at: For the Efficacy of all Sacraments depends upon the Institution of them, and consequently upon the Right which the Administrator has to celebrate them. Wherefore since not only the holy Scripture commands Priests to obey and act by the Authority of their Bishops, but the good Government of the Church, as a Society, requires such a Subordination, in order to preserve Peace and Unity in it; hence it necessarily follows, that no one can have a Right to celebrate any Sacrament, without the Permission of the Bishop of the Diocese: And if he has no Right, the Sacrament he administers must be invalid; it being essential to the Validity of all positive Institutions, whether religious or civil; that they be punctually and in every Point performed, according to the Will of the Institutor. Thus; if a Person not qualified by Law, is employed to execute the Sentence of a Judge, against the Goods or Person of a Debtor; such Execution is Null and Void, and no ways affects the said Debtor: Or if a Person legally qualified to execute the Sentence, shall omit any Ceremony which the Law makes essential, the Execution also is of no effect. And therefore by parity of Reason, if a Clergyman shall presume to officiate, without the Permission of his lawful Superior, it is no wonder that his Ministrations are invalid, in the Sight of GOD; as being not done in the Spirit of Peace and Love, but in opposition to his own appointment. For as *Korah, Dathan, and Abiram* are expressly said, to have gathered themselves together against the Lord, because they murmured against *Aaron*, who had his Authority, *Numb. xvi. 41.* So every



every Presbyter who acts without the Leave of his Superiors, by rebelling against him, rebels against GOD who hath made him OVERSEER, *Acts* xx. 28. See the Great Bishop and Martyr St. *Cyprian*, his Treatise of the Unity of the Church.

Q. *What does the Church of England think of Schism?*

A. She believes it to be a very grievous Sin.

Q. *How does that appear?*

A. From her Offices: For she hath inserted a Petition in her Litany (which is one of the most solemn Parts of her Devotions) against it. From Heresy and Schism, Good LORD, deliver us.

Q. *Is the Church of England's Notion of Schism, the same with that delivered in this Catechism?*

A. It is: As will appear by considering the Explanations given of it by her most learned Members: See Dr. *Hammond* his Treatise of Schism, Bp. *Pearson* his Explication of that Article of the Creed, the Holy Catholick Church, and Dr. *Sherlock's* religious Assemblies.

Q. *Ought not all Members of the Church of England then to avoid this Sin?*

A. All Men are undoubtedly obliged to avoid this and every other Sin, but those of the Church of *England*, and others who use her Liturgy, are, (if possible), more obliged so to do, because otherwise, they must mock GOD by their very Prayers, which it is dreadful to imagine any Christian capable of: And yet surely they who pray to GOD to keep them from Schism at the very Time that they are committing it, either must be shamefully ignorant of what Schism is, and of the Meaning of their own Prayers, or else must be guilty of this very Crime.

Q. *But pray, since Schism is so great a Crime, how can the*

*the Church of England vindicate her Separation from the Church of Rome, with which she was once in Communion?*

- A. To this Question I answer, *1st*, That it does not seem to be true in Fact, that the Church of *England* did separate from the Church of *Rome*; but rather that the Church of *Rome* separated from the Church of *England*, or which is the same, causelessly thrust her out of her Communion: For, it appears by the well vouched History of the Reformation, that the Persons in *England* most devoted to the Bishop of *Rome*, did for several Years after the reformed Religion was fully established, (even as far down as to the tenth or twelfth Year of Queen *Elizabeth*) frequent the public Churches, and join with the Reformers in Worship: And then all of a sudden they separated themselves, and set up an opposite Communion, at the Desire of the Pope, because the Queen had refused to acknowledge again his usurped Supremacy: The Schism therefore is not to be imputed to the Church of *England*, but to the Church of *Rome*.

But *2dly*, Had it been true, that the Church of *England* did separate from the Church of *Rome*, yet it would not from thence follow that she thereby became schismatical; Because every Separation is not a Schism; but such a Separation or Breach of Communion only as is causeless, and without sufficient Reason. For, if a Church teaches Errors for Truths, and requires the Belief of those Errors as Terms of Communion; or if she obliges her Members to do any Thing that is sinful, then it is so far from being a Crime to separate from her, that on the contrary it becomes expressly a Duty; according to the Command of GOD with regard to *Babylon*, *Rev. xviii. 4. Come*

out of her, my People, lest ye be Partakers in her Sins: Or finally, if any Part of the Church refuses another Part, that just and essential Privilege of reforming the Abuses that may have crept in amongst her Members; (a Privilege necessary to the very Being, or at least the Well-being of every Society,) and because she exercises that Privilege, impiously proceeds to censure and Excommunication, it is evident, that such a Sentence is null; and that the Church who Censures becomes herself the Schismatic. Now this was precisely the Case of the Church of *Rome* at the Reformation. She then taught, and still does teach, many Errors for Truths; particularly the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; the Infallibility of the Church; Purgatory; and in short, the twelve additional Articles of Pope *Pius* the IVth's Creed: And she commanded, and still does command, several unlawful Things to be done; viz. the Worship of the Host, Prayers to Saints, &c. &c. and therefore a Separation from her was not, nor can be, Schism. Farther, she refused the Church of *England* the Liberty of reforming those Things which her learned Members have irrefragably proved against all their Adversaries, to be destructive Errors; and therefore, on that Account likewise, it was lawful to forsake her.

See Dr. *Hickes* Controversial Letters; or those Treatises which were written during the Reigns of King *Charles* the II. and King *James* the II. on the several Points in dispute between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, now published in two Vols. Folio.

# POSTSCRIPT

I Am well aware, that this little Book is like to have many Enemies; and that most People will impute the laying so great Stress upon positive Institutions of Sacraments, and especially upon the Necessity of receiving them, only from Clergymen who are at first lawfully authorized by, and all along act in Subordination to, the Bishops of the Church, to Bigotry and Superstition. But if Men consider, that GOD would not confer the Gift of Immortality even upon *Adam*, in a State of Innocence, without the Use of the Tree of Life, which was a Sacrament; and, that Pardon of Sins, and the other Benefits of GOD's Covenant with Mankind, were ever conveyed, from the Fall of our first Parents, down to the Coming of our SAVIOUR, only by means of Sacrifices, which were likewise positive Institutions; they will not wonder that the Benefits of CHRIST's Death should be confined to the Use of Sacraments, under the Gospel; because this is pursuing no other Method than what GOD has used with Men from the Beginning. And, with regard to our being tied down to receive them only from the Hands of such Clergymen as acknowledge the Authority, and act by the Direction of the Bishops of the Church; when it is considered, of how great importance, Peace, Unity, and Order, are to every Society; and that these cannot possibly be preserved, nor Love and Charity which are the very Vitals of Religion, subsist in the Christian Church, without such Subordination and Subjection, the Reasonableness of that Limitation also, immediately appears. How great the Crime of despising *Aaron's* Authority was, is obvious from the Punishment inflicted upon *Korah* and his Company; *Numb. xvi. 32.* and as the Character and Office of the Christian High-priests is greater and more honourable than that of the Jewish was, the Guilt of those who rebel against them, must be proportionably greater: And consequently it need be no Surprise, if it pollute their Sacrifices, and make all their Ministrations offensive to Almighty GOD.